



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,604	08/01/2000	MASOOD GARAH	ODS-23	8445

1473 7590 03/20/2003
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
50TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

ENATSKY, AARON L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3713

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,604

Applicant(s)

GARAHI ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron L. Enatsky

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-86,89-133 and 135-144 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-86,89-133 and 135-144 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges receipt of Applicant's amendment on 2/26/03. Claims 1-86, 89-133, and 135-144 remain pending and claims 87-88 and 134 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-86, 91-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,004,211 to Brenner et al in view of Lappington et al. '413 (Lapp). In regard to claims 1 and 44, Brenner et al. teaches of an interactive off-track wagering (2:35-36) that is run over a computer based system to racing fans in their homes (5:61-64). Wagering is accomplished though network communication from a user terminal to a totalisator (7:35-43), and is communicated wirelessly from the user to the user terminal through any suitable user interface (7:21-34). While Brenner et al. does not specifically teach that the wireless remote control device has a screen with on-screen options, but he does teach that any suitable wireless user interface device can be used in conjunction with television sets for display (7:21-34). Lapp teaches of an interactive TV set-top system using a wireless remote handheld that is capable of displaying events for the purpose of switching between multiple interactive concurrent programs (Abstract). It is well known in that art that audio/video remote controllers are wireless multifunctional

Art Unit: 3713

devices with user interface screens producing user selectable menus. Examples of such are devices specifically made as all-in-one audio/video remotes, or personal digital assistants programmed with an extra function of control audio/video systems. With the remotes such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) it also would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time to display informational/wager choices on the PDA to allow the race to be displayed on a separate display continuously. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brenner et al. to use the wireless handheld taught by Lapp for the purposes as taught above in addition to reasons taught by Lapp such as view multiple concurrent events without losing scores. This would also allow one to place multiple concurrent bets on different races, releasing the constraints of betting only on a single game at any one time.

In regards to claims 2-6 and 45-49, Brenner et al. teaches that the race is a horse race (6:3) where a user can select a horse for a wager, a racetrack, a race, a wager type, and a wager amount (2:45-51).

In regards to claims 7-8 and 50-51, Brenner et al. teaches that totalisator is a computer system capable of handling user transactions, user accounts, crediting accounts when the wager is successful, and standard computer network communications (7:35-54).

In regards to claims 9 and 52, Brenner et al. teaches that the in-home equipment includes conventional television sets (7:26).

In regards to claims 10 and 53, Brenner et al. teaches the transmission of racing data via cable, satellite, or other mediums (6:55-61) and wagers transmitted over a network to computer equipment (7:35-54) where both types of information are received and sent to a user terminal.

Art Unit: 3713

Brenner et al. does not teach that the user terminal is a set-top box, however it is obvious to one skilled in the art that end user terminals for processing cable or satellite data for display on a television set can be set-top boxes.

In regards to claims 11-12 and 54-55, Brenner et al. teaches that the user terminal comprises personal computer equipment (7:55-67), and the computer equipment transmits the wager information to other computer equipment for processing (7:35-54).

In regards to claims 13-30 and 56-73, Brenner et al. teaches handicapping information and race results received by a user terminal (10:9-23). It was established earlier that wireless remote taught by Brenner et al. could comprise of a number of known remote control elements well known in the art such as a PDA therefore it would have been obvious to display handicap information and race results on the wireless remote device sent from the user terminal. In regard to the various claimed wireless remote devices, the handheld computer, electronic book, and web tablet it is well known in that art that these devices are function equivalents and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute these devices for one another. It was also established earlier that the user terminal is a computer device (7:21-34) situated in a user's home (5:59-67) that is capable of network communications (7:35-54). It is well known in the art that a computer can function both as a set-top box as well as functions of personal computer making the devices functional equivalents. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use various equivalent wireless remote devices in communication with a computer device as a user terminal for the purpose of receiving and displaying handicap and race results information to a user where the personal computer

Art Unit: 3713

communication combinations would be better suited to a more technical/computer savvy demographic while the set-top box combinations to a less technical demographic.

In regards to claims 31-43 and 74-86, Brenner et al. teaches that each user can place a wager (7:35-41) from in home equipment (5:35-64) where the wagering system comprises of a large array of user terminals (7:10-11). This would suggest that users are placing wagers that are independent of one another and establishing individuality to the wagering system through the use of a personal identification code (8:41-50). Brenner et al. does not teach the use of a plurality of wireless devices communicating with the user terminal. However, it has long been considered to be within ordinary skill in the art to duplicate elements and their corresponding functions, especially in network communication where multiplicity of like devices is the norm, therefore, obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of handheld devices place independent wagers with a user terminal. In regards to the choice of communication equipment, as established above, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to interchange functional equivalents of the handheld devices and the set-top or personal computer in their respective communication hierarchy.

In re claims 91-133, Brenner et al. in view of Lapp teach the claimed limitations as discussed above. In addition, as is well known in the art, communication exists with computer systems interpreting machine-readable instructions.

In re claims 142-144, Brenner et al. in view of Lapp teaches the claims limitations as discussed above, but does not disclose a set-top box as the sole communication interface between a handheld device and wagering servers. However, as is well known in the art, set-top devices can function both to transmit and receive information to/from remote servers. Lappington also

Art Unit: 3713

teaches that a user can contact operations by using a wireless or wired medium (9:25-27) similar to how data is initially received. In view of Lappington's teaching of commensurate transmit and receive communication mediums, it would not be beyond one of ordinary skill to modify Brenner in view of Lappington so that a single integrated device serves both purposes to reduce system complexity and costs.

Claims 87-90, and 134-141 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,004,211 to Brenner et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,808 to LaDue. Brenner et al. teaches the above mentioned horse race wagering system, but does not disclose the use of a wireless application protocol for communication with a computer system. LaDue teaches the use of a wireless application protocol for use in wireless gaming and wagering (Abstract) for the purpose of operating seamlessly with existing wireless networks without need for further modification (2:26-29). LaDue also teaches the use of a handheld computer for communication with the wagering/gaming system with a built in screen capable of displaying users selectable menus (Fig 9). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the wireless application protocol system for wagering by LaDue with the horse race wagering system as taught by Brenner et al. for the purpose of seamless operation with the existing wireless network infrastructure and so that wagering can take place anywhere legal including the race track or in a user's home.

In re claims 134-136, 138, and 140, Brenner et al. in view of LaDue teach a computer network system for wagering as discussed above. In addition, as is well known in the art, communication exists with computer systems interpreting machine-readable instructions.

Art Unit: 3713

In re claims 137, 139, and 141, Brenner et al. in view of LaDue teach a computer network system for wagering as discussed above. While not specifically disclosing computer equipment as part of a local area network, Brenner et al. shows in Fig. 1 shows the wager processing equipment interconnected. Whether the equipment is connected in a local area or a wide area network, lacking criticality, would not serve to distinguish over prior art. The method of interconnection between equipment would not affect system functionality and could be made equivalent assuming adequate bandwidth.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive. In regard to claims as being unpatentable over Brenner in view of Lappington, Applicant argues that the combination lacks transmitting wager information through in-home equipment to remote computer equipment for processing. Examiner contends that Lappington, though not specifically teaching an integrated device, still meets Applicant's claim of wirelessly transmitting to *in-home user equipment*. The dialer is but one embodiment used to transmit the user information to the remote computer equipment. Furthermore, Lappington teaches that other communications mediums may be employed to remotely transmit information such as radio or cable (9:19-27). As is well known, set-top devices can function both to transmit and receive information to/from remote servers and in view of Lappington's teaching of commensurate transmit and receive communication mediums, it would not be beyond one of ordinary skill to modify Brenner in view of Lappington so that a single integrated device serves both purposes.

Applicant also asserts that Examiner fails to provide adequate motivation for the combination of Brenner in view of Lappington. Applicant reasons that Examiner provided

Art Unit: 3713

motivation that could not be accomplished from the teachings of Lappington. Applicant believes that Examiner improperly intended to portray a user multitasking, where the modification allows user to simultaneously place multiple bets. Lappington teaches that a user can participate in several interactive programs at the same time (2:27-45). Thus, one of ordinary skill would modify Brenner so that a user can switch between the several wager programs to place wagers. Furthermore, the concurrency of betting cannot be construed beyond the meaning of allowing participation in concurrent wagering programs. A user could wager on one race, switch to another race, switch back to the initial race or switch to a third race to make further wagers, providing concurrent wagering. A processor, let alone a human operator can generally only perform a single task at one time. An example of such can be drawn to current Microsoft Windows (MS Windows) operating systems. MS Windows is considered a multitasking operating system allowing a user to use more than one program at once such as a word processing program and an e-mail program. A user can operate the programs concurrently by typing a letter in an e-mail program switching to the word processing program to write a paper at the same time. These actions are considered concurrent operations, but only in as much as the human operator can muster the input. Thus the motivation of wagering concurrency is proper.

Applicant also contends that supporting evidence from "Products of the Year 1998" and Lappington '239 still fail to teach Applicant's improvements over Brenner. As discussed above, Applicant's claims still read on Brenner in view of Lappington as the dialer is *in home user equipment*. Assuming arguendo, if Applicant specifies that a set-top device was used for all communication (two-way communication), as is well known, set-top devices can function both to transmit and receive information to/from remote servers. Additionally, "Products of the Year

Art Unit: 3713

1998”, while not teaching receiving data from a set-top device, shows the transmission from a handheld device to a set-top device.

In regard to the rejection over Brenner in view of LaDue, Applicant arguments of Examiner’s supporting arguments, found in the Final Rejection of Paper No. 6, claims that Examiner contradicts the motivation to combine Brenner and LaDue. Examiner contends that Brenner in view of LaDue still teaches Applicant’s invention and contains proper motivation to combine. Brenner was discussed as teaching wireless wagering to and from a user terminal through any suitable user interface. LaDue was used to show that using a wireless application protocol for wireless wagering is known and can be integrated into existing wireless networks without requiring additional network build-outs. Examiner’s statement, found in the Final Rejection of Paper No. 6 (page 7, lines 17-19), toward the obviousness of having equipment on the server side does not in any way teach adding any additional equipment. Having the equipment is obvious, with respect to the necessity of having the equipment in the first place. The communication equipment would already be in place for the existing wagering system.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moura et al. '121 teaches a set-top device with integrated communication facilities that can be used with any type of communication medium.

Davis '048 teaches a set-top device with integrated communication facilities with two-way communication.

Art Unit: 3713

Harms et al. '362 teaches a set-top device with integrated communication facilities with two-way communication.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron L Enatsky whose telephone number is 703-305-3525. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on 703-308-4119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

Aaron Enatsky
March 18, 2003


VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700